

tors, motor cars and like couriers and carriers, a respectable remnant of the human frame can overcome most of the handicaps of mutilation.

If the head stays intact, a missing feature or so isn't necessarily a sentence to dependence. Commonsense is a general servant and with a little coaching, can learn to substitute for any of the missing five.

We are to have so many disabled folk that the problem of their autonomy will perforce direct unprecedented attention to reclamation and re-education of industrial as well as military "blessés".

Employers will cooperate with institutions and put the maimed of the Republic on a preferential basis in such special occupations as they can demonstrate parity with normals.

Our streets shan't ring with the whine for alms—the hat holders and cup bearers already there reproach enlightenment. We should have helped them to their feet long ago. The remarkable achievements of retinkered European soldiers indicate that the only hopeless cripple is a deliberate shirker.

Vivisection Debate at the Commonwealth Club

At the monthly dinner of the Commonwealth Club of California held at the Hotel St. Francis, San Francisco, on Thursday, December 19, 1918, the subject set for discussion was "Vivisection—Is It Necessary to Medical Progress?"

After the introductory remarks of President Boynton, Dr. Wm. Ophuls, vice-chairman of the club's section on public health, read the report of the section, explaining the necessity for animal experimentation. The report was written as an answer to the "misinformation disseminated broadcast by the various anti-vivisection societies and others who are not thoroughly informed on the subject," and took up the subject briefly from the standpoint of physiology, pathology, bacteriology, and medicine. The report advised strongly against the passage of the so-called regulatory laws, such as those in force in England.

Prof. Samuel S. Maxwell, associate professor of physiology at the University of California, then read a ten-minute paper on "The Necessity of Vivisection in Physiological Research," summing his statements in the conclusion that "it is not too much to say in general that prohibition of vivisection at the present time would virtually end progress in physiological service."

Prof. Karl F. Meyer, director of the George Williams Hooper Foundation for Medical Research, followed with a strong presentation of his experience in dealing with epidemic diseases of animals and man in Central Africa, and contrasted the saving of human and animal life through such experiments with the terrible death rate where no such treatment was followed.

Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, chairman of the club's section on public health, closed the presentation on behalf of the report with a brilliant address.

Mme. C. E. Grosjean was then called upon for a presentation of the views of the anti-vivisectionists. She argued that vivisection was unnecessary, that its results were ineffective and often harmful, and that the practice was cruel and tended to make its practitioners callous to suffering. She digressed from the subject to close with a strong protest against the use of aspirin in the treatment of influenza.

The subject was then thrown open to general debate under the five-minute rule and Dr. Mayo Newhall, Dr. Emmet Rixford, and others spoke for the general conclusions of the report, while B. L. McHenry and Mrs. E. C. Harrington spoke against it. A delegation of members of the Legislature was present.

Harrison Law

NARCOTICS FOR INSTITUTIONS.

Where there is no pharmacy connected with a hospital, and all drugs administered to patients are obtained through prescriptions written by a visiting physician, no narcotic record should be required of the hospital, according to a ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, received by Collector Justus S. Wardell.

The Collector is further advised that the disposition of narcotic drugs obtained through order forms only is required of such an institution, that is to say, if drugs administered to a patient within the hospital are taken from the drug stock of that institution, an accurate record must be kept of their disposition, in order to check up the records as shown by the inventory and official order forms on file.

Any narcotics left at such an institution by a patient for whose use they were prescribed by a visiting physician should be taken up on the inventory of the hospital, and a record kept of their disposition in event the patient is discharged. Narcotic drugs brought into a hospital by a visiting physician for a particular patient to be administered by a nurse under the direction of the physician, should be made a matter of record by the physician and not by the hospital, except where unused drugs come into the possession of the institution as indicated above.

HARRISON NARCOTIC LAW INTERPRETED.

For the information of registered dealers in and dispensers of narcotic drugs under the provisions of the Harrison Narcotic Law, Collector of Internal Revenue Justus S. Wardell calls attention to Treasury Decision No. 2200. In this decision the words "dispensed," "distributed," "prescribed" used in the Harrison Narcotic Law are construed.

The quantity of any of the Narcotic drugs that may be dispensed or prescribed at one time, is discussed. The decision also states the requirement of the law, in the matter of the treatment of addicts or habitues to effect a cure and of patients suffering from an incurable or chronic disease. The latter part of the decision states what are the duties of registered dealers in these matters.

The following is a copy of Treasury Decision 2200:

"The Act of December 17, 1914, provides that a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon registered under the provisions of the law may dispense or prescribe any of the narcotic drugs coming within its scope to patients upon whom he shall 'personally attend' and 'in the course of his professional practice only.'"

"This office construes the words 'dispensed,' 'distributed,' or 'prescribed,' used in the act, as synonymous, and that a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon 'dispenses' within the meaning of the law when he writes a prescription calling for any of the narcotic drugs to be filled by a registered dealer.

"While the law does not limit or state the quantity of any of the narcotic drugs that may be so dispensed or prescribed at one time, it does provide that it shall be unlawful to obtain by means of order forms any of the aforesaid drugs for any purpose other than the use, sale, or distribution thereof in the 'conduct of a lawful business in said drugs or in the legitimate practice of his profession.' Further, that all preparations and remedies containing narcotic drugs coming within the scope of this act are 'sold, distributed, given away, dispensed, or possessed as medicines and not for the purpose of evading the intentions and provisions of this act,' and it is further provided that it shall be